

## Interview Summary

Applicant(s)

09/882,671

Applicant(s)

SUGINO ET AL.

Examiner

Tamra L. Dicus

Art Unit

1774

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tamra L. Dicus.

(3) Nickolas Seckel.

(2) Dawn Garrett.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 June 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: all.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Dawn Garrett  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
1774  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the Declaration and pointed to the measurement at 80 degrees C which is different from the manufacturing temperature of 105 degrees C. Applicant stated the Declaration was to show the dry stretching of Nakamura and Downey resulted in a higher stretching force. The Office stated that the material appears to be different as the Declaration shows (polyvinyl acetate) while the references use PET and PVA polarizers. The Applicant may reconsider submitting another Declaration.